DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 970 CE 080 519

AUTHOR Palazon, Francisco
TITLE Transformative Learning and Marginalization.
PUB DATE 2000-00-00
NOTE 8p.
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; *Adult Educators; *Adult Learning; Definitions; Essays; Learning Processes; *Learning Theories; Outcomes of Education; Politics of Education; *Social Isolation; Teacher Role; *Teacher Student Relationship; *Transformative Learning; Values; World Views
IDENTIFIERS *Marginalized Groups

ABSTRACT

This paper, which is directed toward adult educators, presents a new approach to understanding the concept of marginalization, as well as a series of educational proposals regarding working with marginalized people that are drawn from transformative learning theory. First, marginalization is defined as being out of religious, legal, and scientific-medical norms. The physical and social consequences of each type of marginalization are discussed. Two additional types of marginalization--cognitive and political--are introduced and considered in the context of transformative learning theory. The concept of meaning perspective and the three types of factors that shape it (epistemic, psychological, and sociolinguistic) are explored from the standpoint of transformative learning theory and their implications for adult educators. Next, the importance of familiarity with transformative learning theory when working with adult learners who belong to marginalized groups is emphasized. The following responsibilities that must be assumed by such adult learners are listed: (1) actively foster learners' critical reflection upon their assumptions; (2) establish communities of rational discourse in classrooms; and (3) help learners learn how to take appropriate action resulting from transformative learning to the extent feasible. The paper ends by introducing a proposal to resolve the marginalization and norms dichotomy. Contains 27 references. (MN)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Palazón

Transformative Learning and Marginalization

Francisco Palazón

ED 443 970

This paper presents a new approach to the understanding of MARGINALIZATION, as well as a series of educational proposals to work with marginalized people that draw from the contributions of the Transformative Learning Theory. Until now Marginalization has been seen as a usual phenomenon that had to be treated by Social Workers and Adult Educators. In this paper, I present an archeology of Marginalization to establish how different set of rules have provoked Marginalization.

Marginalization: Marginalized people are by definition those who are out of the Norm.
Norms: The importance in the following paper of Norms is focussed on their genesis.
Involvement: Concept referred to the role of Adult Educators; defined by the Transformative Learning Theory; and capable of breaking the Marginalization-Norm dichotomy.

I. THE BODY AS THE CENTRAL CONCEPT TO UNDERSTAND MARGINALIZATION

I will begin with an analysis of Marginalization from the Genealogy of the Norm, the Genealogy of the Rite and the Genealogy of the Sciences.

I.1. SOCIAL MARGINALIZATION VERSUS THE NORM

Marginalized people are by definition those who are out of the Norm, out of the social norms. The first problem with this definition arises when we realize that the Norm is neither fixed nor stable, but instead varies both within the different social subgroups that compose our complex and heterogeneous society - social spaces where the Norm of the group excludes those individuals that belong to other groups -- as in time - when different social patterns which have at a certain time been marginalized, become normal -. For example: the norms to dress, talk and behave of a group of hippies make them marginalized vis-à-vis the middle-class society; however we could equally state that the norms to dress, talk and behave of a group of University professors make them marginalized vis-à-vis the suburban societies: there is a displacement from the limited normative space of the subgroups. Another very different situation occurs in homogeneous societies such as tribes or compact subgroups. Other norms, written in legal codes, have considered extra-matrimonial couples as marginal during the sixties and seventies. However, there has been a shift in the perception of their situation, both socially and legally, which has changed the limits between the Norm and Marginalization.

Norms have in my opinion, three main originating systems: the religious, the political-legislative, and the scientific-medical. Each one of them produces a different type of marginalization. The first marginalized people are heretics - we could even call them marginalized by antonomasia -. The second are criminals. The third are disturbed and antisocial. The first group is quartered, the second imprisoned and the third re-educated:

NORMS	MARGINALIZED	BODIES	PUNISHMENTS	SOCIAL APPRAISAL
RELIGIOUS	HERETICS	QUARTERED	MARK	HERETIC/MESSIAH
LEGAL	CRIMINALS	IMPRISONED	SIGN	CRIMINAL/HERO
SCIENTIFIC	ANTISOCIALS	DISCIPLINED	TRACE	MARGINALIZED GROUPS

Norms are useful to protect the social order. For this they need docile bodies. Marginalization is the result either of the rigidity of the Norm (Cf. F. & F. Basaglia), or of the rebellion. In both cases there is, passive or active, conscious or unconscious, rebellion.

Heretics spread sects, schisms, and social movements: "bogomilios", flagellants, fraticellis, "dulcinistas", "simples", hermetics, ... Some of them made possible the triumph of new norms, such as Protestants, which generated new marginalized/heretics: Calvinists, who, once settled in a position of power, religiously burned other marginalized - e.g. Miguel Servet -. Others, after having a lot of followers in a first period, disappeared or emigrated to other countries - e.g. USA -. Foucault (1981a), in his discussion of the three forms of organizing the power to punish at the end of the eighteenth century, points out that the first form was based on the old monarchical right. The power of the sovereign that converts the body in the object of the torture, in a ceremony that is testimony of his strength. I believe it is possible to understand the religious norm in the same way as the monarchical right. The monarch is so by divine right. The technologies of the sovereign's power are the same as those used for centuries by religion. The tortured, mutilated and burnt bodies of the heretics are the same as those of the sovereign's defeated

CE 080 515

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

enemies. The ceremony of punishment is the same. The King and the Pope are symbols of an equal system of norms which provokes the same type of exclusion, of marginalization. As heretic is that who makes an attempt on the sovereign's law as that who makes one on God's law.

Criminals, outlaws and bandits: the despicable, take the baton of Marginalization after the heretics. Once again we find on one hand, the genesis of the norm, in this case arising from the complex political-legal system, and on the other hand, the ambivalence of the social appraisal of the marginalized. The bandit becomes a hero and an evil person. Numerous myths and legends are created around him - e.g. Robin Hood, who steals from the rich for the poor, who lives and hides in the woods because he is politically persecuted, and is finally betrayed by one of his group and thus caught...-. Foucault (1981a:79), brilliantly analyses this shift from the social appraisal of the criminals of the seventeenth century to their new consideration in the eighteenth century: *'the seventeenth century criminals are exhausted, malnourished men, completely dominated by the moment, irascible, summer criminals; those of the eighteenth century are cunning, calculating rogues, marginalized criminals'*. The former, whose paradigm is, in my view, the heretic, make attempts on the divine laws (represented either by the absolute monarch or by the Pope). Their punishment must be so terrible that the body becomes the mark of the sovereign's strength and revenge. The later, whose paradigm is, in my opinion, the bandit, make attempts on society. This other kind of marginalization responds to a new stratification of the social classes as Foucault claims (Ibid.:91): *'Stealing becomes the first way to break the law in the move from a society of political-legal exaction to another of appropriation of the means and products of labor. (...) This separation covers a class opposition given that on one hand, the most accessible illegality for the popular classes will be that of the products: violent transferring of goods; whereas on the other hand, the bourgeoisie will keep the illegality of rights: the possibility of breaking their own rules and laws'*. The treatment given to the bodies in both cases is also quite different. Now, it is not a question of marking them with the powerful signs of the sovereign, or to seek revenge at a public ceremony, but rather to imprison them so as 1) to defend society, and 2) to try to manipulate the soul of the marginalized so that they understand that their "wrong doings" will provoke more misfortunes than benefits.

Finally there is another level to the genesis of Marginalization (or otherwise to the genesis of the Norm). The heretic has handed the baton over to the bandit, and the bandit to the "antisocial". Who is the "antisocial"? In Spain the sadly famous LEY DE PELIGROSIDAD Y REHABILITACION SOCIAL of the 4th of August 1970, modified by the Law 43/1974 of the 28th of November, made it difficult, until the advent of democracy, to distinguish between "antisocial marginalized" and "criminal marginalized". In the dictatorial political systems, the legal empire does not easily give up its power to define the limits between normal and abnormal to the scientific system. In Spain, *"homosexuals, prostitutes, layabouts and beggars, drug addicts and alcoholics, those who manifest a "delinquent predisposition or inclination", minors abandoned by their families or rebelling against them, who are morally perverted, ill and mentally handicapped people who (...) represent a risk for the community"*, were all considered criminals by this particular Law. In the last years of Franco's dictatorship, at the dawn of the democracy in Spain, we saw how marginalized groups started to fight: the group Mujeres Libres, the Frente Homosexual de Acción Revolucionaria (F.H.A.R), the Colectivo de Psiquiatrizados en Lucha, the Comités de apoyo a COPEL (Coordinadora de Presos Espanoles en Lucha). Marginalization became a "medical" problem. The marginalized were somehow put into "psychiatric care". Madness, the patrimony of humanity as Erasmus had claimed, was loaded on the shoulders of a few anathematized and condemned to be "the others". It is no longer a question of sovereign revenge, nor of the defense of society, it is something subtler, fainter: the aim is to discipline the subject and create docile bodies that will respond to the norms not by coercion but by positive acceptance. The figure of the marginalized loses definitely its ambivalent individual meaning (heretic/messiah, bandit/hero), and can only resist social pressures by joining collective forces to defend its difference, to create an "alternative system of norms" in which each individual is "equal" to his group, in which difference and marginalization are social matters. And here we are!

I.2. MANUAL WORK VERSUS INTELLECTUAL WORK

If the kind of Marginalization generated by the different systems of norms has a "visible" treatment of the body (quartering and torture, imprisonment and disciplines), there is another type of marginalization that is more diffused, more symbolic, a greater constitutive and structural part of society. It is no longer a marginalization concerning individuals or groups -which had the danger of "idealizing" the other, the difference or different, like it happens with the double multicultural appraisal which oscillates between two idealist postures: the rejection of difference in its various racist and xenophobic senses, and the idealization of difference in its "light" and cynic postmodern version of "everything counts"-. Now, I will analyze a kind of marginalization which is established on the differences between occupations, between the different works of men and women. From this marginalisation we have to study

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to effects. On one hand, there is at a social level, a class division which, - together with other great symbolic systems: production of goods, access to culture, relation to the law...- is also arising within the woven ritual relation with work. On the other hand, there is at an individual level, marginalized people who are not subject to repressive measures (up to the docility demanded by the new social technologists) but are simply silenced.

Rites, as everybody knows, are relationships between men and gods. In my opinion, there are two big originating systems or rites: theistic and lay or secular. The former are expressed by liturgies of which I. Illich (1989:48) claimed: *'the liturgy studies how solemn gestures and chants, hierarchies and ritual objects not only create the belief but also the reality of the community as Church which is the object of this belief'*. The way the later are expressed is called technology, and is in my view, **'a ritual action dignified and legitimized by Science' :**

RITES	EXPRESSION	ACTION	BODIES
SACRED	LITURGY	PROFANE	SPECTATORS
SECULAR	TECHNOLOGY	UNCULTURED	EXECUTORS

Priests' liturgies establish marginalization based on men's actions in the world. The interpreters of the world, of the Word of God (in the Talmud, in the Bible or the Koran), do not act in order to produce but rather to communicate with God. Marginalized are here that immense majority of people who work with their hands, whose bodies are twice silenced. Silenced as spectators before the liturgy and silenced again as denied/marginalized/despised actors in their everyday work. In the history of humanity, the division between manual and intellectual work has been, and continues to be a constant (Cf. Carbonaro). Actions are clearly related to manual work. Investigation, on the other hand, to intellectual work. Going back to history, it can be affirmed that in Western societies, God was the supreme responsible, until Modernity, of the order of things. The justification and legitimization of the division between those who labored/acted, and those who governed the (spiritual and/or material) destinies of the others (and theirs), was also divine. Scientists, craftsmen and artists belonged to the group of those who acted for a long time. A view, maybe a little idyllic, of this first moment of the modern science, is offered by P. Park (1992:171), when he claims: *'the base for the new science was formed by the knowledge of craftsmen that transformed the medieval social structure, not by the classes that were being replaced (nobility and cultivated). It was the genius of Galileo and the other sages who learned from seafarers, from those who made lenses, from artillerymen and others dedicated to practical work. They took the knowledge from the people, they converted it in systematic science and they gave it back to the people with the aim of providing them with power. (They gave it back as Galileo who wrote his treaties in Italian, the language of the people, not in Latin, the language of the Universities)'*.

In the shift from the Classic to the Modern Age, Reason, with a capital R, became the new legitimizing source: 'science holds the place of the dead God' (Ibanez, 1979:48). Priests, interpreters of the Word of God (in the sacred texts), give way to scientists, interpreters of Reason (in the encyclopedia). Action, then profane, becomes uncultured and unscientific. The marginalized and silenced bodies that were spectators of the liturgies and executors of their work, continue to be quiet executors silenced by science and technology's dictums.

I.3. THE KNOWING SUBJECT VERSUS THE COGNIZABLE OBJECT

The genealogy of the Norm has led us to a kind of marginalization defined by **docile** bodies. The genealogy of the Rite to a kind of marginalization defined by **silent** bodies. Now, we shall see how in the genealogy of Science, the bodies appear **separated**. This new kind of marginalization is determined by a reason which in its attempt to apprehend the world, excludes/marginalizes that which it cannot explain: affection, poetry, empathy, shared meanings, dialogued views of the world... All of these are labeled as "irrationalities" which are not useful, and thus are demeaned and treated as contingency, as foam of things.

SCIENCE	COGNITIVE MARGINALIZATION	POLITICAL MARGINALIZATION
SUBJECT/OBJECT	SEPARATION OF OTHER KNOWLEDGES	SEPARATION OF OTHER WAYS OF PARTICIPATING

The compared liturgy discovers how the rites create myths. The technological ritual has created numerous myths. One specially widespread (Cf. Schon), has been the myth of the hierarchy of knowledge (basic sciences, applied sciences, and common technological skills) in the training of professionals. The technological rationality has maintained its hegemony in all theories of knowledge. Legitimated by scientific Reason and ritualized by the skills of professionals, it was created and created - in a double

feedback movement - the myth of an action funded on knowledge and truth (that of the social researchers), and of a popular action funded on superstition and ignorance (that of the researched). From this premise it was perfectly justifiable to separate knowing subjects (scientists) from cognizable objects (people).

This "recent" type of marginalization is manifest both in cognition or kinds of knowledge, and in politics or kinds of representation. About the former, N.O. Brown (1972:129) affirms: *'The separated observer: distanced subject and object; the duality subject-object. (...) Thus, cognition, like politics, is mediated by representative institutions. Therefore, the correspondence is a relation of similarity, copy or imitation between the internal image and the external reality; instead of being a correspondence as sympathy or active participation'*. However we would be mistaken if we limited scientific marginalization to a mere cognitive separation. It conceals, moreover, another separation: the political one. According to Brown (1972:128-129): *'The separated observer, who participates without acting, is a passive spectator. The division of citizens in those who are politically active and those passive is the main premise of Locke's and Descartes' paradigm, a wax board for passive impressions: "The error in the empirical theories of perception has been the representation of human beings as passive observers who receive impressions from the exterior"'*.

II. TRANSFORMATIVE LEARNING THEORY AND MARGINALIZATION

Following the study of Marginalization from the Genealogy of the Norm, the Rite and the Sciences, I will now present two aspects of the Transformative Learning Theory in relation to this analysis: How are Norms, Rites and Sciences acquired, internalized; and What should be the role of Adult Educators facing Marginalization. Finally, I will conclude with a proposal where Marginalization and Norms are not understood as a dichotomy.

II.1. HOW ARE NORMS, RITES AND SCIENCES ACQUIRED?

The Transformative Learning Theory explains the concept of the Meaning Perspective as *'a set of expectations that constitutes an orienting frame of reference that we use in projecting our symbolic models and that serves us as a (usually tacit) belief system for interpreting and evaluating the meaning of experience'* (Mezirow, 1991:42). It also presents the factors that shape these Meaning Perspectives: 1) Epistemic -in my opinion these are the closest to "learning" given that they refer to knowledge: 'Cognitive/learning/intelligence styles; External/internal evaluation criteria; Concrete/Abstract thinking...'-; 2) Psychological -in my opinion these are related to "individual emancipation" versus "social emancipation", as 'Self-concept, Tolerance of ambiguity, Inhibition...'-; and 3) Sociolinguistic -which are in my opinion more political and closer to Marxist emancipation-. It is in the later factors where we find what provokes/justifies Marginalization or the experience of Marginalization (Social norms/roles; Cultural/language codes; Language/truth games; Common sense as a cultural system; Secondary socialization; Ethnocentrism; Prototypes/scripts; Philosophies/theories).

In chapter 5 (Mezirow, 1991) "*Distorted Assumptions: Uncovering Errors in Learning*", we find, once again, the three factors that shape Meaning Perspectives. These often function unconsciously within us since we have acquired them during our socialization. The distortions of the codes we learn, limit us, make us less permeable, and do not facilitate the integration of new experiences. It is not possible here to mention each of the authors that Mezirow analyses at length on this subject, however, I would like to point out some examples related to each group of codes -epistemic, psychological and sociolinguistic-, for their significance to the educational praxis, given that they show us a way to identify the individual's difficulties and learning levels. Thus in the epistemic distortions we find: Kitchener's seven stages in the development of reflective judgement, which range from the religious and/or political fanaticism to the "reflective judgement"; the nine dimensions of Knox's "cognitive styles"; Geuss' three types of distorted epistemic premises. Secondly, in the psychological distortions there is Gould's work on the five implicit assumptions involved in the "analysis of regret". Finally in the sociolinguistic distortions we locate Freire's study of intransitive consciousness, magical consciousness, naive consciousness and critical reflection.

I believe that the analysis of these distortions -in particular the sociolinguistic distortions- help adult educators to understand Marginalization and provide them with a model of implication.

II.2. THE INVOLVEMENT OF ADULT EDUCATORS

There are two ways of analyzing Involvement: the psychoanalytical or European and the Marxist or Latino-American. The topic of Involvement implies -as a topic of knowledge- a conception of knowledge and a conception of power. In my view, the psychoanalytical perspective, characteristic of the European development, comes from the critique of cognition as knowledge whereas the Marxist perspective, characteristic of the Latino-American development, comes from the critique of cognition as power. The analyst, the researcher, the sociologist, the adult educator ... are not neutral. From the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

European perspective, and in my opinion under the influence of Freud, the assumption of the non-neutrality entails firstly the need to analyze the counter-transference (and secondly a discussion about power, where the subject is more emphasized than the community). The Involvement situates the subject researcher at the center of the research (it converts him into a subject who needs to investigate itself). The psychoanalytical perspective directs its analysis of involvement towards its effects on the subject (which can later influence, or not, the community). On the other hand, the Marxist perspective, aims its analysis of involvement to its effects on the community. The involved researcher becomes a militant researcher when the starting point is cognition as power. A number of Latino-American authors (Cf. Freire, Fals Borda, Molano, Briones, ...) have developed the analysis of the role of the involved researcher in social change (this analysis brought them to formulate another model of knowledge). Under the influence of the Marxist theory of cognition, the research becomes transformative action which produces knowledge. Moreover, the cognition is a collective production attached to the social class which has produced it. The militant researcher does not focus his involvement on an analysis of *'the psycho-affective, historic-existential and structure-professional levels'* (Goyette & Lessard-Hébert, 1988:38), but rather on *'his participation with the people's struggle'* (Park, 1992:150). The empathic relationship between the community and the researcher cannot be explained via interpersonal phenomena (transference/counter-transference), but via social phenomena (oppressor/oppressed). That is why, involvement becomes social commitment. Although, in my opinion, involvement is always commitment. for the psychoanalytical perspective commitment goes from the libidinous/affective/ personal to the economic/institutional/social, whereas for the Marxist perspective commitment follows the opposite way.

I believe that the Transformative Learning Theory is located in the psychoanalytical tradition of social and pedagogical work. That is why, in chapter 6 (Mezirow, 1991) "*Perspective Transformation: How Learning Leads to Change*", we find tension between individual change: *'Perspective transformation involves a sequence of learning activities that begins with a disorienting dilemma and concludes with a changed self-concept that enables a reintegration into one's life context on the basis of conditions dictated by a new perspective'* (Ibid., 193) and learning as a social process: *'Perspective transformation is a social process: others precipitate the disorienting dilemma, provide us with alternative perspectives, provide support for change, participate in validating changed perspectives through rational discourse, and require new relationships to be worked out within the context of a new perspective'* (Ibid., 194).

The adult educator who works with socially marginalized needs to know of the Transformative Learning Theory to start from the certainty that their own meaning perspectives are not neutral. Moreover, according to Mezirow (1991:211-212), *all adult educators have the responsibility to do the following:*

1. *Actively foster learners' critical reflection upon their assumptions, not only concerning the content and process of problem solving, but also concerning the premises behind their sociolinguistic, epistemic, and psychological beliefs.*
2. *Establish communities of rational discourse in classrooms, workshops, conferences, and action settings, with norms consistent with the ideal condition of learning, within which beliefs may be questioned and consensually validated.*
3. *Help learners learn how to take appropriate action resulting from transformative learning to the extend feasible.*

II.3. BEYOND THE NORMS-MARGINALIZATION DICHOTOMY

Dichotomies have become sterile and threaten to make us (both social scientists and social workers) also sterile. Human thought maintains a tension between the look for universals and a local treatment of events. Sciences take over from the legal norms -with its highest paradigm: the Declaration of Human Rights- which had themselves taken over from monotheist religions -expansionist, messianic and warlike- with the aim to give human beings codes to know and behave with universal validity. After that, during the eighties, some schools of thought of the social sciences take a different path -heterodox- and propose a local knowing and also local rules to behave. A (philosophic) polemic underlies this tension: Universal Values (Marxism, techno-sciences, Habermas' dialogue community...) versus Particular Values (respect of difference, Identity politics, feminist, ethnic, homosexual and popular movements...). Modernism versus a part of Postmodernism which we could denominate as "of resistance". However, these particular values end up victim of the same uniform (and dichotomyc) logic which they criticize in Modernism (Cf. Anyon). That is why, the social thinkers and workers of the nineties commit themselves for more complex systems of thought and action which break dichotomies adding a multiplicity of factors that make the system (ecosystem) open and chaotic, at the same time as they look for provisional conclusions.

I will finish this paper with a reflection: Marginalization is the product of a ordered system of Norms, Rites, and Sciences. Changing this system for another system of Norms, Rites and Sciences does not resolve the problem. The problem does not lie on the choice between one system or another. It is not within one moral or another. The problem is how to recuperate our ethical capacity. And our ethical capacity is immoral because it is capable of questioning our moral values (those we have learned from our culture). Our ethic should be, have to be, to escape from the Nietzschean individualism, "constitutive" (Cf. Marina). This constitutive ethic has to be capable of imagining a new moral from and for all. Like Ibanez claimed: *'a dreaming bird is worth two sleeping birds'*. Finally, and going from Erasmus to N.O. Brown (Ibid.:274-75), I affirm:

Our true choice is in between the saint madness and heathen madness: open your eyes and look around; in any case, madness is riding. (...) To resist madness can be the craziest way of being crazy. (...) It is possible to be mad and not blessed; but it is not possible to get a blessing without being mad; it is impossible to reach the light without disorder.

REFERENCES

AA.VV., (1977), Grupos Marginados y Peligrosidad Social, Ed. Campo Abierto, Madrid.

AA.VV., (1981), Investigación Participativa y Praxis Rural. Nuevos conceptos en Educación y Desarrollo Comunal, Mosca Azul Editores, Lima.

Anyon, J., (1994), "The Retreat of Marxism and Socialist Feminism: Posmodern and Poststructural Theories in Education", en Curriculum Inquiry 24:2, Blackwell Publishers, Cambridge.

Basaglia, F. & Basaglia, F., (1971), La mayoría marginada, Ed. Laia, Barcelona.

Briones, G., (1978), "Sobre cuestiones de objeto y método en la investigación militante", en Molano, A., (Comp.), Crítica y política en ciencias sociales, Punta de Lanza, Bogotá, tomo I.

Brown, N. O., (1972), El Cuerpo del Amor, Editorial Sudamericana, Buenos Aires.

Carbonaro, A., (1986), Travail Manuel, Travail Intellectuel et Education, Unité de l'Education Permanente ED/SCM, Unesco, Paris.

Cristina Salazar, M., (ed.), (1992), La Investigación-Acción Participativa. Inicios y desarrollos, Popular-O.E.I.- Quinto Centenario, Madrid.

Fals Borda, O., (1981), "La Ciencia y el Pueblo", en AA.VV., Investigación Participativa y Praxis Rural", Mosca Azul Editores, Lima.

Foucault, M., (1970a), Nietzche, Freud, Marx, Anagrama, Barcelona.

Foucault, M., (1981a), Vigilar y castigar, Siglo XXI, Madrid.

Foucault, M., (1981b), Un diálogo sobre el poder, Alianza, Madrid.

Freire, P., (1969), La educación como práctica de la libertad, Siglo XXI, Madrid.

Freire, P., (1970), Pedagogía del Oprimido, Siglo XXI, Madrid.

Freire, P., (1990), La naturaleza política de la educación. Cultura, poder y liberación, Paidós/M.E.C., Barcelona.

Freire, P. & Macedo, D., (1989), Alfabetización. Lectura de la palabra y lectura de la realidad, Paidós/M.E.C., Barcelona.

Goyette G. & Lessard-Hébert, M., (1988), La Investigación-Acción. Funciones, Fundamentos e Instrumentación", Laertes, Barcelona.

Ibanez, J., (1979), Más allá de la sociología. El grupo de discusión: Técnica y crítica, Siglo XXI, Madrid.

Marina, J.A., (1995), Ética para náufragos, Anagrama, Barcelona.

Mezirow, J., (ed.), (1990), Fostering Critical Reflection in Adulthood. A guide to Transformative and Emancipatory Learning, Jossey Bass, San Francisco.

Mezirow, J., (1991), Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning, Jossey Bass, San Francisco.

Molano, A., (Comp.), (1978), Crítica y política en ciencias sociales, Punta de Lanza, Bogotá.

Palazón, F., (1987), Educación de Adultos: Una tarea de Animación, Dirección Provincial del M.E.C., Murcia.

Palazón, F., (1992), "La investigación-acción como metodología puente entre la educación de adultos y el desarrollo comunitario", en Revista de Pedagogía Social nº 7, Universidad de Murcia, Murcia.

Palazón, F., (1993), "Implicación, Acción-Reflexión-Acción", en Revista de Documentación Social nº 92, Cáritas, Madrid.

Park, P., (1992), "Qué es la Investigación-Acción Participativa. Perspectivas teóricas y metodológicas", en Cristina Salazar, M. (ed.), La Investigación-Acción Participativa. Inicios y desarrollos, Popular-O.E.I.-Quinto Centenario, Madrid.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Schon, D.A., (1992). La formación de profesionales reflexivos. Hacia un nuevo diseño de la enseñanza y el aprendizaje en las profesiones. Paidós/M.E.C., Barcelona.